

30



2812

501.39868X00

Applicants: T. SAITO et al

Serial No.: 09/850,162

Filed: May 8, 2001

For: A SEMICONDUCTOR INTEGRATED CIRCUIT DEVICE AND  
METHOD OF MANUFACTURING THE SAME

Group: 2812

Examiner: R. E. POMPEY

RECEIVED  
DEC 17 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

December 11, 2003

Sir:

A personal interview was held with the Examiner on November 13, 2003, in which the following represents a confirmation of the substance of that interview, in connection with the above-identified application. The Examiner's written summary of the Interview is provided in form PTOL-413 as supplemented in the Continuation Sheet attached thereto, a signed copy (by the Examiner) of which was given to applicant's undersigned representative at the end of that interview. The Examiner indicated, at that time, that a reply to the Examiner's Interview Summary Record need not be submitted by applicants. This is confirmed by the last sentence in the Continuation Sheet of the Interview Summary Record, which states that "[a]pplicant does not have to respond to this action." However, in order to complete the record and also be considered in full compliance with MPEP §713.04, this statement is being submitted.


The discussion during the interview included a reiteration of the supportive discussion/rebuttal arguments submitted in the Amendment After Final dated September 29, 2003. In that regard, the four cited references as applied in the

outstanding Final Office Action rejection were discussed in detail and, also, why the claimed subject matter, and, in particular, all of the independent claims, as further amended in the Amendment After Final, are patentable thereover. As was affirmed by the Examiner's comments in the Continuation Sheet of form PTOL-413, on the basis of the discussion held with him, the amendments made to each of the independent claims (in the Amendment After Final) render all of the claims allowable even over the combined teachings of the four cited art documents in the rejection of the Final Office Action. In particular, the Examiner agreed that at least the further cleaning step performed on the insulating film such as after the formation of the cap conductive film on the wiring ... was not taught even over the combined teachings of those references. The Examiner also iterated, in the interview, that unless he uncovers additional "new" art documents that would necessitate issuing a new rejection, he would likely enter the Amendment After Final in connection with the mailing of a formal Notification of Allowability of the above-identified application. This is also confirmed by the Examiner's detailed comments in the Continuation Sheet of form PTOL-413 of the Examiner Interview Summary.

Acceptance and formal entry therefor of this Statement in connection with completing the record is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper to the Deposit Account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account 01-2135 (501.39868X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
**ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP**

  
Larry N. Anagnos  
Registration No. 32,392

LNA/dks  
(703) 312-6600